

PREPARING TOMORROW'S TEACHERS TO USE TECHNOLOGY (ESEA, TITLE III, SUBPART 1, SEC. 3122)

Goal: To improve the knowledge and ability of future teachers to use technology in improved teaching practices and student learning opportunities, and to improve the quality of teacher preparation programs.

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: This initiative supports Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 1.7 (Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education) by providing competitive grants to consortia that are implementing improvements in teacher preparation programs.

FY 2000--\$75,000,000

FY 2001--\$XXXXXXX (Requested budget)

Objective 1: Strengthen teacher preparation programs so that they provide high quality training in the use of technology for instructional purposes.

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
1.1 Curriculum redesign. The percentage of teacher preparation programs that redesign their curriculum to incorporate best practices in the use of technology in teacher education will increase. Actual Performance: <i>This is a new program for 1999.</i>			Status: Unable to judge Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Project Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> annual <i>Next Update:</i> Dec. 2000 Formative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 Summative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:		No target set		
2000:		Continuous increase		
2001:		Continuous increase		

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
1.2 Technology-proficient faculty. The percentage of faculty members in teacher preparation programs that effectively use technology in their teaching will increase. Actual Performance: <i>This is a new program for 1999.</i>			Status: Unable to judge Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Project Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> annual <i>Next Update:</i> Dec. 2000 Summative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:		No target set		
2000:		Continuous increase		
2001:		Continuous increase		

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
1.3 Graduation requirements. The number of teacher preparation programs that will require teacher candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the effective use of technology in teaching and learning will increase. Actual Performance: <i>This is a new program for 1999.</i>			Status: Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program so <u>program-specific</u> performance data are not yet available. However, related national-level data are available from Education Week's report, "Technology Counts." According to "Technology Counts '99," 42 states require teacher preparation programs to include technology. Two limitations to these data are: (1) preparation requirements vary widely among states; and (2) inclusion of technology in teacher preparation does not imply that new teachers are technology-proficient.	Sources: Project Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> annual <i>Next Update:</i> Dec. 2000 Summative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Education Week's "Technology Counts" <i>Frequency:</i> annual <i>Next Update:</i> fall 2000 Validation Procedures: "Technology Counts": data corroborated by internal review procedures of an experienced data collection agency. Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:		No target set		
2000:		Continuous increase		
2001:		Continuous increase		

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
1.4 Learning resources. The percentage of teacher preparation programs that use web-based, multi-media learning resources, course materials and teaching tools will increase. Actual Performance: <i>This is a new program for 1999.</i>			Status: No 1999 data but progress toward target is likely. Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Project Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> annual <i>Next Update:</i> Dec. 2000 Summative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:		No target set		
2000:		Continuous increase		
2001:		Continuous increase		

Objective 2: Increase the technology skills and proficiency of new teachers for improved classroom instruction.

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
2.1 Technology-proficient new teachers. The percentage of new teachers who are proficient in using technology and integrating technology into instructional practices will increase. Actual Performance: <i>This is a new program for 1999.</i>			Status: Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program so <u>program-specific</u> performance data are not yet available. However, related national-level data are available for this indicator from the NCES report, Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers. According to this report, in 1998, only 24 percent of new teachers (with 0-3 years of teaching experience) felt “very well prepared” to integrate educational technology in the grade or subject they taught.	Sources: Project Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> annual <i>Next Update:</i> Dec. 2000 Summative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 NCES, Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers, 1998 <i>Frequency:</i> every 2 years <i>Next Update:</i> Jan. 2001 Validation Procedures: <i>Teacher Quality:</i> Data validated by NCES’s review procedures and <i>NCES Statistical Standards</i> . Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:		No target set		
2000:		Continuous increase		
2001:		Continuous increase		

Objective 3: Create institutional change in the preparation of future teachers to use technology.

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
3.1 Sustained program activities. At least 35 percent of program consortia members will continue to implement reform in pre-service teacher training for at least two years following the termination of federal funding. Actual Performance: <i>This is a new program for 1999.</i>			Status: Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Source: Summative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:		No target set		
2000:		35 percent of program consortia whose federal funding has ended will continue to implement reform in pre-service teacher training		
2001:		40 percent of program consortia whose federal funding has ended will continue to implement reform in pre-service teacher training		
2002:		45 percent of program consortia whose federal funding has ended will continue to implement reform in pre-service teacher training		

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
3.2 Inter-disciplinary partnerships. The percentage of teacher preparation programs that communicate, collaborate and partner together with schools of arts and sciences on a regular and formal basis will increase. Actual Performance: <i>This is a new program for 1999.</i>			Status: Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Project Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> annual <i>Next Update:</i> Dec. 2000 Formative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 Summative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:		No target set		
2000:		Continuous increase		
2001:		Continuous increase		

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
3.3 K-16 partnerships. The percentage of teacher preparation programs that communicate, collaborate, and partner together with the K-12 community on a regular and formal basis will increase. Actual Performance: <i>This is a new program for 1999.</i>			Status: Unable to judge. Explanation: This is a new program so performance data are not yet available.	Sources: Project Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> annual <i>Next Update:</i> Dec. 2000 Formative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2000 Summative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees. ED does not collect national level baseline data for this indicator.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:		No target set		
2000:		Continuous increase		
2001:		Continuous increase		

Objective 4: Create statewide change in the preparation of future teachers to use technology.

Indicators, Targets, & Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
4.1 State teacher certification standards. The percentage of states that include technology proficiency as a component of their initial teacher certification standards will increase. Actual Performance: <i>Percentage of states that have technology-related requirements as a component of their initial teacher certification standards.</i>			Status: No 1999 data but progress toward target is likely. Explanation: Data from the Milken report includes states that require teachers to meet a technology requirement either through credit hours of coursework, or through a performance-based assessment. Data for 1999 are not available from any of the data sources for this indicator. However, 1998 data from the Milken report demonstrate that in addition to the 15 states that currently have technology requirements for certification, 7 states are in the process of adopting standards. This indicates that progress is likely in increasing the percentage of states meeting this goal.	Sources: Milken Exchange on Education Technology's report, "Education Technology Policies of the 50 States" <i>Frequency:</i> one-time survey <i>Next Update:</i> unknown Project Performance Reports <i>Frequency:</i> annual <i>Next Update:</i> Dec. 2000 Summative Evaluation <i>Frequency:</i> longitudinal <i>Next Update:</i> 2002 Validation Procedures: "Education Technology Policies of the 50 States": data supplied by the Milken Exchange on Education Policy; data corroborated by internal review procedures of an experienced data collection agency. Evaluation data collection will be verified by: on-site monitoring and review; and survey and analyses performed by an experienced data collection agency with internal review procedures. Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Performance report data will be self-reported from program grantees.
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	<i>States with technology related requirement</i>			
1998:	15			
1999:		15 states		
2000:		18 states		
2001:		20 states		

Key Strategies

Strategies continued from 1999

- ❖ To address the use of effective practices for teacher preparation programs, the program office will encourage the sharing of information among grantees through a peer collaboration process and the development of a grantee website.
- ❖ To address reporting requirements, the program office will provide technical assistance to grantees on such topics as evaluation, and it will ensure accurate interpretation of program activities and requirements.
- ❖ To address the outreach and communication efforts of the Department, the program office will work with professional organizations to promote program goals through participation in national, state and regional conferences. The program office will also sponsor workshops to help potential applicants learn about the program and facilitate the sharing of information on effective strategies across consortium grantees.

How This Program Coordinates with Other Federal Activities

- ❖ To address the issue of evaluation, the program office will continue to work with ED's Office of Education Technology to coordinate and participate in national conferences such as the Secretary's Conference on Educational Technology: "Evaluation the Effectiveness of Technology."
- ❖ To address teacher quality, the program office will coordinate with the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants program to collaborate on common issues of preparedness, certification, and technology.

Challenges to Achieving Program Goal

- ❖ None.

Indicator Changes

From two year old Annual Plan (FY 1999)

Adjusted

- ❖ None.

Dropped

- ❖ None.

From last year's Annual Plan (FY 2000)

Adjusted

- ❖ None.

Dropped

- ❖ None.

New

- ❖ All indicators are new to the FY 2001 Annual Plan